REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 18, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto. Claims 5-7 have been added. Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

The rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Grant is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites a method of managing user connections sessions with a gateway wherein user status information is stored in a table in a RADIUS server during times that an authenticated user session is established with the gateway. The RADIUS server is on a physically separate machine than the gateway and is connected to the gateway via the computer network. After a failure of the gateway, it sends a request to the RADIUS server to provide the user status information and user data corresponding to each user in the table. The user data is re-stored on said gateway so that the gateway routes user traffic to continue the authenticated user session in response to the user data and the user status information without requiring re-authentication following the failure.

Sitaraman et al provides a network system for managing dynamic IP address assignment. An AAA service which may include the RADIUS protocol is used by Sitaraman to determine whether a user attempting to log in is authorized to obtain an IP address (col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 4). As stated at col. 7, lines 7-9, the "AAA service 10 is implemented in a computer, preferably the same machine or server as that of the protocol gateway 4..." Sitaraman fails to either teach or suggest maintaining user data on a gateway for routing user traffic according to authenticated user sessions, storing the user data in a RADIUS server which is physically separate from the gateway, and restoring the user data from the RADIUS server to the gateway after a gateway failure. Since Sitaraman prefers the AAA service to reside on the same computer as its gateway, it in fact teaches away from the claimed method.

The addition of Grant et al fails to strengthen the rejection. Grant relates to the availability of an application running on a logical unit. There is no teaching or suggestion in Grant of either a gateway for routing user traffic or the maintenance of

any user data in connection with an authenticated user session. Grant maintains session state information for an application outside of the logical unit that may fail in order to be able to resume suspended sessions. Neither traffic routing nor gateway authentication using RADIUS are pertinent to the discussion in Grant. Thus, nothing in Grant either teaches or suggests maintaining user data that allows a gateway to recover authenticated user sessions after gateway failure. Therefore, the combination of Sitaraman and Grant fails to produce the claimed features, and claim 1 is allowable over these references.

Claims 2-4 depend from an allowable claims and are therefore themselves allowable for the same reasons.

Claims 5-7 recite additional patentable features over the cited references. Specifically, Sitaraman and Grant lack the host object and connection object recited in claim 5, the delayed storing of user data recited in claim 6, and the service selection gateway recited in claim 7.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-7 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: March 15, 2005
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)